arXiv:1611.07432v1 [q-fin.ST] 5 Nov 2016

"Chaos" in energy futures markets: a controversial matter.

Loretta Mastroeni*
loretta.mastroeni@uniroma3.it

Pierluigi Vellucci*
pierluigi.vellucci@sbai.uniroma1.it

Abstract

In this paper we study the possible "chaotic" nature of some energy and commodity futures time series (like heating oil and natural gas, among the others). In particular the sensitive dependence on initial conditions (the so called "butterfly effect", which represents one of the characterizing properties of a chaotic system) is investigated estimating the Kolmogorov entropy, in addition to the maximum Lyapunov exponent. The results obtained with these two methods are consistent and should indicate the presence of butterfly effect. Nevertheless, this phenomenon — which is usually showed by deterministic systems — is not here completely deterministic. In fact, using a test introduced by Kaplan and Glass, we prove that, for all the series analyzed here, the stochastic component and the deterministic one turn up to be approximately in the same proportions. The presence of butterfly effect in energy futures markets is a controversial matter, and the evaluations obtained here confirm the findings of some authors cited in this paper. Thus, we can say with reasonable certainty that in energy futures markets we cannot talk about deterministic butterfly effect.

JEL classification: C45; C53; D40; Q47.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, chaos theory has been considered in various scientific fields such as economics, finance, physics, and many others. An important reason for the interest in chaotic behaviour is that it can potentially identify, among many time series, which of them appear to be random. In particular, as for financial markets, evidence on deterministic chaos would have important implications for regulators and short-term trading strategies. The

Keywords: chaos, butterfly effect, entropy, energy futures.

*Dept. of Economics, Roma TRE University, via Silvio D'Amico 77, 00145 Rome, Italy.

question is whether such random-looking data are really random or they are completely deterministic. If it is completely random, then their behaviour is not predictable anyway; otherwise, it is possible to predict a deterministic system on short periods of time (whereas, long prediction is impossible, due to the instability of chaotic systems). Hence, this distinction provides the predictability degree of the analyzed system.

In Benedetto et al. (2015, 2016) the authors have introduced a processing method for the analysis of financial and commodity price time series to assess the predictability of financial markets. This technique, exploiting the maximum entropy method (MEM), predicts the entropy of the next future time interval of the investigated time series by a least square minimization approach. It provides results which can be easily understood: high entropy values characterize unpredictable series, while more stable series exhibit lower entropy values. In fact, it is well known since the publication of the pivotal work of the mathematician C. Shannon (1948) that the concept of entropy is related to that of uncertainty. The *Shannon entropy* has led to the publication of many works in the field of entropy-based analysis of financial markets. Entropy has been used, for instance, to gain insight into the evolution of the aggregate market expectations Gençay and Gradojevic (2010); Gradojevic and Gencay (2008).

In the numerical evaluations made here, we deal with a different kind of entropy, the so-called *Kolmogorov entropy*. From a theoretical point of view, the latter is related to Shannon entropy in a way highlighted by Benci and Menconi (2005) (see Theorem 4.1, p. 207), in which it is stated the equivalence between Shannon and Kolmogorov entropies. The Kolmogorov entropy is used to test for *sensitive dependence on initial conditions*, or "butterfly effect", the most popular property of chaotic systems, even if, broadly speaking, one uses the term "chaos" as a synonym of the "butterfly effect". These concepts are not equivalent but we will not dwell on the subject in the present paper (see Mastroeni and Vellucci (2016a)).

The butterfly effect entails that, if two initial conditions slightly differ for a quantity δx, their difference after time δt will be $\delta x e^{\lambda \delta t}$ with $\lambda > 0$, that is, with exponential separation. Small differences in initial conditions (such as those due to rounding errors in numerical computation) yield widely diverging outcomes for such dynamical systems, making long-term prediction impossible in general.

During the last 20 years, researchers have shown their great interest throughout the new ways of using elements of the so-called "chaos theory" to analyze economic and financial time series. According to this theory, very complex behaviors of financial series, which appear to be random, may be explained by a deterministic nonlinear system. In particular, we recall the following results in the field of commodity futures markets. Chwee (1998) tests for the presence of butterfly effect using the NYMEX 1-month, 2-month, 3-month, and 6-month daily natural gas settlement prices, from

April 1990 to September 1996. The results fail to provide significant evidence of butterfly effect. Serletis and Gogas (1999) test for butterfly effect in seven Mont Belview, Texas hydrocarbon markets, using monthly data from 1985:1 to 1996:12 (the markets are those of ethane, propane, normal butane, isobutane, naptha, crude oil, and natural gas). In their paper they find an evidence of butterfly effect.

In Panas and Ninni (2000) the authors investigate butterfly effect in daily price data for two major petroleum markets, namely those of Rotterdam and the Mediterranean. The sample consists of the daily prices of different oil products from 4 January 1994 to 7 August 1998, resulting in 1161 observations. All prices were collected from OPEC. The main empirical results obtained by Panas and Ninni's analysis are summarised in Table 5 on Panas and Ninni (2000). They claim to show strong evidence of butterfly effect in a number of oil products considered.

Adrangi et al. (2001) investigate the presence of butterfly effect in crude oil, heating oil, and unleaded gasoline futures prices from the early 1980s. Daily returns data from the nearby contracts are diagnosed employing correlation dimension test, the BDS test and Kolmogrov entropy. While they find "strong evidence of non-linear dependence in the data, the evidence is not consistent with chaos".

The study performed by Panas (2001) analyzes the daily pricing for nonferrous metals (aluminium, copper, lead, tin, nickel and zinc), considering daily closing metal prices over the period from January 1989 to December 2000 (the number of observations is 2987 and the tin series begins in August, 1989) and finding evidence of "deterministic chaos only in the case of tin returns".

Adrangi and Chatrath (2002) employ daily prices of the nearby (expiring) palladium and platinum futures contracts traded on The Commodity Exchange from November 1983 through March 1995 and January 1975 through June 1995, respectively, and they focus their tests on daily returns. They find that the nonlinearity in palladium and platinum is inconsistent with chaotic behavior.

Chatrath et al. (2002) conduct tests for the presence of low-dimensional chaotic structure in the futures prices of four agricultural commodities: soybean (from 1969 to 1995), corn (from 1969 to 1995), wheat (from 1968 to 1995), cotton (from 1972 to 1995). Though there is strong evidence of non-linear dependence, the evidence suggests that there is no long-lasting chaotic structure. Moshiri and Foroutan (2006) examine daily crude oil futures prices from 1983 to 2003, listed in NYMEX; their test provides a negative evidence of butterfly effect. Matilla-García (2007) studies the butterfly effect nature of three energy futures series — natural gas, unleaded gasoline and light crude oil — finding its "evidence in futures returns".

Kyrtsou et al. (2009), analyze five energy products (crude oil, gasoline, heating oil, propane, and natural gas) over the period from 1994 to mid-

January 2008. They reject the null hypothesis of butterfly effect behavior. Barkoulas et al. (2012) consider a data set which consists of daily oil spot prices covering the period 1.2.1985 - 8.31.2011. They do not find butterfly effect tendencies in the oil market, suggesting that "oil spot prices are the measured footprint of a stochastic rather than a deterministic system" (pp. 585 Barkoulas et al. (2012)).

The aim of the present paper is the following.

We study the possible "chaotic" nature of two energy futures time series (heating oil, natural gas). We also study some different commodity series considered in the previous paper Benedetto et al. (2016): two metals series (gold, silver), two grains (corn, oats), two soft commodities (cocoa, coffee) and two other agricultural commodities (feeder cattle, lean hogs) futures from the Chicago Board of Trade (CBOT), Chicago Mercantile Ex-change (CME), Inter Continental Exchange (ICE), New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX), and its division Commodity Exchange (COMEX).

The butterfly effect can be checked by an entropy test Farmer (1982), Grassberger and Procaccia (1983b) which employed the Kolmogorov entropy, Kolmogorov (1958), and the Largest Lyapunov exponents Schuster and Just (2006), Ott (2002), Strogatz (2014), Kodba et al. (2004). Differently from Mastroeni and Vellucci (2016a), we investigate the hypothesis of butterfly effect by estimating the Kolmogorov entropy, in addition to the maximum Lyapunov exponent.

The results obtained with the Kolmogorov entropy and the maximum Lyapunov exponent are consistent and should indicate the presence of butterfly effect. Nevertheless, this phenomenon — which is usually showed by deterministic systems — is not here completely deterministic. This result is in accordance with some experiments documented in physics; in fact, it is argued that some time series generated from stochastic systems might show sensitive dependence on initial conditions Tanaka et al. (1996), Ikeguchi and Aihara (1997), Tanaka et al. (1998). Therefore, using a test introduced by Kaplan and Glass (1992) with a package developed by Kodba et al. (2004), we prove that, for all the series analyzed here, the stochastic component and the deterministic one turn up to be approximately in the same proportions.

The presence of butterfly effect in energy futures markets is a controversial matter, and our evaluations confirm the findings of some authors cited in this paper, as Barkoulas et al. (2012) or Kyrtsou et al. (2009): such a tangible presence of a stochastic component doesn't allow to conclude that there is an evidence of deterministic butterfly effect. In other words, the energy commodities generally encompass both a stochastic and a deterministic contribute, which are comparable. The same can be stated for the other commodity futures series considered here (see Section 3).

This might not happen in other types of markets. In Mastroeni and Vellucci (2016b), we applied our tests to some other financial (not commodities) series: some of them show strong evidence of butterfly effect generated from

an underlying deterministic system.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we consider the implications of chaos in energy futures markets. In Section 3 we explain the results of the paper while in Section 4 we discuss and interpret them. Section 5 is devoted to the conclusions while the Appendix 1 (Section 6) is devoted to the mathematical methodologies of the tests we conducted here, in comparison with some others that appear in the literature.

2 Concepts and implications of butterfly effect in commodity markets

Several studies show evidence of nonlinearity for various financial time series: Barnett and Serletis (2000), Franses and Van Dijk (2000), Sarantis (2001) and Zhang et al. (2001), among others.

Nonlinear dynamics may be able to explain a large set of time series behaviors. One motivation for this line of research is to determine whether the non-linearities are consistent with chaotic time paths, which have several properties that should be of special interest for commodity market observers. For instance, an apparent stochasticity of time series that could be generated by deterministic systems, or the butterfly effect.

In the literature the interest in whether a futures series is chaotic has been focused on the debate, inter alia, on the worth of the forecasting/technical analysis in the very short-run. In fact, a couple of decades ago, several studies showed that this (nonlinear) analysis may provide better results in predicting the price behavior of many financial instruments. See for instance, among the others: Osler and Chang (1995), Clyde and Osler (1997) and references therein. These works are a little dated and deal with financial instruments (not commodities) but are also very interesting since they link the success of technical analysis in the short-time and the chaoticness of time series.

Osler and Chang (1995) examine a technical strategy that can be viewed as one of a large class of nonlinear prediction rules potentially deriving from nonlinear versions of structural models such as the monetary model, chaos models, and many others. "Many of these models have been shown to fit the data with some acceptable level of explanatory power within sample, and some appear to be helpful in forecasting conditional exchange rate variances. Nonetheless, out of sample tests of these models indicate that they generally forecast short term exchange rate changes with little or no greater success than the random-walk model" Osler and Chang (1995). Clyde and Osler (1997) simulate a "chaotic" (we would say "sensitive to initial conditions") price series and prove that in Head-and-Shoulders trading strategies there is considerable evidence of the fact that technical analysis does work better on nonlinear data than on random data, but the frequency of "hits" (success)



Figure 1: Effect of a small change of initial condition.

employing the technical trading rule become comparable after just a few trading days (Table IV Clyde and Osler (1997)). Thus, there is evidence that short term traders timers could benefit from knowing whether or not the price series are affected by butterfly effect.

Let us try to give a basic motivation in order to explain, from a purely theoretical/mathematical point of view, the above empirical reasoning. Let us consider the time series y_n and assume that there exists a system (g, f, x_0) such that $y_n = g(x_n)$, $x_{n+1} = f(x_n)$, where x_0 is the initial condition at the initial time $n = 0$, and where g maps the m-dimensional phase space $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and f maps $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^m$. The function f maps an unknown (to the econometrician) dynamics that governs the evolution of the unknown (to the econometrician) state x_0. The econometrician observes y_n. The task is to uncover information about (g, f, x_0) from observations y_n. The time series y_n, which we will assume as the data time series under analysis, has a chaotic explanation if x_n is chaotic. The question is whether it is possible to forecast a chaotic series. Intuitively, the butterfly effect usually doesn't allow long-term forecasting of chaotic series. If we change slightly the value of initial point: $x_0 \mapsto x_0' = x_0 + \delta x_0$, the point x_n at discrete time n will also be changed (see Fig. 1). What may happen is that, when time becomes large, the small initial distance δx_0 grows anyway, and it may grow exponentially fast: $\delta x_n \sim \delta x_0 e^{\lambda n}$, for some $\lambda > 0$. The term δx_n represents the uncertainty induced by perturbations. Hence, fixed δx_0 and λ, it is bounded if $e^{\lambda n}$ is bounded and so if n is as small as possible ($n = 1$ or $n = 2$, for instance): this is the short-term forecasting of chaotic series, which is possible because δx_n is amplified at a finite rate $e^{\lambda n}$. Accordingly, for chaotic time series, if one knows (g, f) and could measure x_n without error, one could perfectly forecast x_{n+i} and, thus, y_{n+i} in the short time (say a few days when dealing with daily data).

3 The empirical results

In this Section we test for sensitive dependence on initial conditions and determinism of the following futures series: two energy series (natural gas, heating oil), two metal series (gold, silver), two grains (corn, oats), two

soft commodities (cocoa, coffee) and two other agricultural commodities (feeder cattle, lean hogs) futures from the Chicago Board of Trade (CBOT), Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME), Inter Continental Exchange (ICE), New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX), and its division Commodity Exchange (COMEX). The time series were obtained from `http://www.quandl.com`.

In this paper, since the energy futures time series show an irregular random behaviour that often resembles chaos, we test the series in order to verify whether it indeed originates from a deterministic system. For this purpose, we employ the determinism test introduced by Kaplan and Glass (1992), using a package developed in Kodba et al. (2004). We recall that the determinism coefficient κ introduced by Kaplan and Glass (1992) and used here, is equal to 1 for a deterministic system, while for a random walk $\kappa = 0$. Then, for the intermediate cases, κ measures the distance of time series from a deterministic system and from a stochastic process. The idea is to take the *determinism coefficient* κ, obtained by Kaplan and Glass' test, as a measure of the reliability level (in percentage) of the test on sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Actually, it is known that time series generated from stochastic systems also might show positive maximal Lyapunov exponents Tanaka et al. (1996), Ikeguchi and Aihara (1997), Tanaka et al. (1998).

3.1 Kolmogorov entropy test

To calculate the Kolmogorov entropy K, we used a Matlab Mat (2015) code due to K. Lee and available on Matlab Central File Exchange. It is based on an algorithm presented in Pincus (1991), Pincus and Kalman (2004), which numerically quantify the Kolmogorov entropy content of a finite time series. In Pincus (1991), Pincus and Kalman (2004), an empirical method for evaluating the entropy of a series is proposed, namely the approximate entropy (ApEn). ApEn needs two input parameters to be specified in order to evaluate the approximate entropy of a given time series: a block or run length m, and a tolerance window r. Then, the ApEn procedure first measures the logarithmic frequency that runs of patterns that are close (within the tolerance window r) for m contiguous observations remain close (within the same tolerance r) on the next incremental comparison. Widely used values for the two input parameters are $m = 1$, $m = 2$, and $r = 20\%$ of the standard deviation of the analyzed time series

The standard deviation of heating oil and natural gas series considered here are, respectively, 0.8411 and 2.4140. Hence the tolerances are, respectively: $r = 0.1682$ for heating oil and $r = 0.4828$ for natural gas. Then, we have the following table.

m	r	K
1	0.1682	0.0714
2	0.1682	0.0567
1	0.4828	0.1876
2	0.4828	0.1631

Table 1: Kolmogorov entropy for: heating oil ($r = 0.1682$), temporal range 06.03.1979 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 8.825; natural gas ($r = 0.4828$), temporal range 03.04.1990 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 6.042.

The standard deviation of corn and oats series are, respectively, 135.1795 and 82.1691. Hence the tolerances are $r = 27.0359$, for corn, and $r = 16.4338$ for oats. The results, for $m = 1, 2$ are reported in Table 2.

m	r	K
1	27.0359	0.0912
2	27.0359	0.0760
1	16.4338	0.1294
2	16.4338	0.1102

Table 2: Kolmogorov entropy for: corn ($r = 27.0359$), temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817; oats ($r = 16.4338$), temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817.

The standard deviation of cocoa and coffee series are 791.3339 and 51.5489, so their tolerances are, respectively, $r = 158.2668$ and $r = 10.3098$. See the following table.

m	r	K
1	158.2668	0.1916
2	158.2668	0.1597
1	10.3098	0.2129
2	10.3098	0.1821

Table 3: Kolmogorov entropy for: cocoa ($r = 158.2668$), temporal range 05.01.1970 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.097; coffee ($r = 10.3098$), temporal range 17.08.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.194.

The tolerances of gold and silver series are, respectively, $r = 75.7169$ and $r = 1.4824$. Their entropies are showed in Table 4.

m	r	K
1	75.7169	0.0471
2	75.7169	0.0360
1	1.4824	0.1233
2	1.4824	0.0890

Table 4: Kolmogorov entropy for: gold ($r = 75.7169$), temporal range 31.12.1974 - 14.05.2014, number of samples 9.884; silver ($r = 1.4824$), temporal range 13.06.1963 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 12.758.

Finally, the tolerances of feeder cattle and lean hogs are, respectively, $r = 5.5841$ and $r = 3.4018$. Their entropies are showed in Table 5.

m	r	K
1	5.5841	0.0938
2	5.5841	0.0740
1	3.4018	0.1749
2	3.4018	0.1557

Table 5: Kolmogorov entropy for: feeder cattle ($r = 5.5841$), temporal range 06.09.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.258; lean hogs ($r = 3.4018$), temporal range 25.06.1969 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.297.

The positivity of K denotes the presence of butterfly effect, indicating the degree of uncertainty which is found in the analyzed time series. Nevertheless, we recall that time series generated from stochastic systems might show sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Accordingly, in the following section, we achieve the same results of Kolmogorov entropy test with Maximum Lyapunov exponent, we estimate the determinism coefficient κ and we search for butterfly effect.

3.2 Maximum Lyapunov exponent and determinism coefficient

Let's now investigate the presence of low-dimensional chaotic structure. With the term *low-dimensional chaos* we usually refer to a dynamics with only one positive Lyapunov exponent Harrison and Lai (1999), while, on the contrary, high-dimensional chaos corresponds to more than one positive Lyapunov exponent. High and low-dimensional chaos in this sense are not linked to the *embedding dimension*. Intuitively, the embedding dimension can be thought of as the smallest dimension required to embed an object. In other words, it is the minimum dimension of the space in which you can reconstruct a phase portrait starting from a sequence of empirical data; this "reconstruction" shall meet some requisites, for example the trajectories have not to cross over one another. The term "reconstruction" is no coincidence; in fact, the embedding dimension, usually denoted with m, is a very important parameter involved in the so-called *attractor reconstruction*, Packard et al. (1980), Takens (1981).

Dealing with this difference is beyond the scope of this paper and it will be treated elsewhere. Nevertheless, considering a three-dimensional system with the Lyapunov exponent spectrum $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$, it has been proved

that $(+, 0, -)$ indicates a chaotic attractor. Hence, if, by definition, a high-dimensional chaotic system has at least two positive Lyapunov exponents, the Lyapunov exponent spectrum will be $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = (+, +, 0, -)$, and the minimal dimension for a high-dimensional chaotic system will be $m = 4$. This also means that, for $m < 4$, we can have only the presence of low-dimensional chaos.

In order to investigate the presence of low-dimensional chaotic structure, fixing the embedding dimension $m = 2$ or $m = 3$, for each commodities we analyze the determinism rate κ on varying of τ. We use a package written in $C++$ code, which can be downloaded from M. Perc's Web page [1], as described in Kodba et al. (2004).

To calculate the maximal Lyapunov exponent λ_{max}, we used a Matlab Mat (2015) code due to Wolf et al. and available on Matlab Central File Exchange. It is based on an algorithm presented in Wolf et al. (1985), which estimates the dominant Lyapunov exponent of a 1-D time series by monitoring orbital divergence. The algorithm was distributed for many years by the authors in Fortran and C and it has just been converted to Matlab. This algorithm has known a widespread success in literature: suffice it to say that while we write this paper, the work due to Wolf et al. was cited 6963 times (source: Google Scholar).

The main empirical results obtained in our analysis are summarised in Tables 6-25. In them one uses the results on the determinism coefficient shown in the Web Page of the authors [2]. The Tables exhibit Maximum Lyapunov exponents corresponding to the highest values of determinism coefficient.

3.2.1 Energy commodities

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	2	0.501905	2.7159
2	39	0.444272	1.7691
2	4	0.441020	2.5150
2	28	0.433819	2.0525
2	5	0.431399	2.4318

Table 6: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for Heating OIL HO1, temporal range 06.03.1979 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 8.825. Case $m = 2$.

[1] M. Perc Web Page, `http://www.matjazperc.com/ejp/time.html`.

[2] `https://www.sbai.uniroma1.it/~pierluigi.vellucci/research.html`

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.537274	2.2768
3	4	0.485819	2.3791
3	3	0.478729	2.6322
3	5	0.469815	2.2892
3	7	0.454737	2.0076

Table 7: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for Heating OIL HO1, temporal range 06.03.1979 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 8.825. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	16	0.493609	12.5925
2	14	0.477181	12.3958
2	2	0.476278	13.9755
2	15	0.459651	11.6615
2	8	0.452906	13.1308

Table 8: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for Natural GAS, temporal range 03.04.1990 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 6.042. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.565059	12.1163
3	3	0.483286	11.8509
3	16	0.476005	8.9366
3	8	0.473239	10.4472
3	4	0.472915	10.9943

Table 9: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for Natural GAS, temporal range 03.04.1990 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 6.042. Case $m = 3$.

3.2.2 Metal commodities

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	3	0.489044	24.4784
2	5	0.465226	24.0839
2	2	0.456577	25.4966
2	8	0.448837	22.4963
2	7	0.442106	23.4737

Table 10: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for gold, temporal range 31.12.1974 - 14.05.2014, number of samples 9.884. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	3	0.531438	18.1700
3	2	0.506349	19.2298
3	4	0.502471	17.2510
3	5	0.493774	17.0392
3	6	0.463394	16.4198

Table 11: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for gold, temporal range 31.12.1974 - 14.05.2014, number of samples 9.884. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	3	0.584441	8.7240
2	2	0.539251	9.1777
2	37	0.522654	7.7477
2	4	0.513922	8.8770
2	11	0.509231	9.1586

Table 12: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for silver, temporal range 13.06.1963 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 12.758. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.558494	7.9119
3	37	0.558470	5.4364
3	12	0.555139	6.7713
3	3	0.554552	7.7742
3	26	0.554486	5.6650

Table 13: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for silver, temporal range 13.06.1963 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 12.758. Case $m = 3$.

3.2.3 Agricultural commodities

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	2	0.451341	26.7392
2	6	0.430972	25.6784
2	3	0.425454	24.0761
2	7	0.417999	25.2264
2	4	0.412920	25.8715

Table 14: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for corn, temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.505033	21.5846
3	3	0.487838	20.5987
3	6	0.462445	18.4301
3	17	0.447398	13.9730
3	7	0.442093	18.0656

Table 15: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for corn, temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	2	0.522350	25.5752
2	3	0.470007	26.2965
2	10	0.466300	24.4598
2	9	0.451354	24.5279
2	4	0.452566	25.817

Table 16: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for oats, temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.541386	21.4109
3	4	0.478380	19.9372
3	3	0.474839	20.6605
3	7	0.469301	18.4473
3	5	0.464176	19.3570

Table 17: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for oats, temporal range 01.07.1959 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 13.817. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	2	0.525573	28.6262
2	3	0.475253	28.1655
2	4	0.464536	27.4032
2	11	0.461731	26.5235
2	10	0.461047	26.3072

Table 18: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for cocoa, temporal range 05.01.1970 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.097. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.572778	21.4880
3	3	0.528161	21.3915
3	4	0.498591	20.2860
3	8	0.485252	18.2033
3	23	0.477853	14.6553

Table 19: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for cocoa, temporal range 05.01.1970 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.097. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	2	0.556027	27.9529
2	3	0.548497	27.5722
2	4	0.523482	27.0104
2	5	0.519849	27.0746
2	6	0.499945	27.1334

Table 20: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for coffee, temporal range 17.08.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.194. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.564286	22.0474
3	3	0.527508	20.9905
3	4	0.516443	20.5522
3	5	0.505925	19.1511
3	6	0.500501	18.8168

Table 21: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for coffee, temporal range 17.08.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.194. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	3	0.601737	22.7581
2	4	0.601512	23.1067
2	2	0.599795	22.9782
2	5	0.592142	22.3606
2	7	0.588680	22.6513

Table 22: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for feeder cattle, temporal range 06.09.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.258. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.640043	20.1569
3	3	0.613383	19.4931
3	4	0.597255	18.9934
3	5	0.552234	17.9511
3	6	0.530954	17.7789

Table 23: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for feeder cattle, temporal range 06.09.1973 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 10.258. Case $m = 3$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
2	4	0.493715	25.1116
2	2	0.492298	25.2678
2	5	0.475814	25.0252
2	16	0.472698	22.5836
2	3	0.472162	24.7424

Table 24: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for lean hogs, temporal range 25.06.1969 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.297. Case $m = 2$.

m	τ	κ	MLE
3	2	0.529423	22.1573
3	3	0.507155	21.4599
3	4	0.497957	20.7467
3	6	0.474202	19.1765
3	5	0.470333	20.0412

Table 25: Maximum Lyapunov exponent (MLE) for lean hogs, temporal range 25.06.1969 - 15.05.2014, number of samples 11.297. Case $m = 3$.

These results suggest that there is no strong evidence of sensitive dependence on initial conditions (butterfly effect) for the series considered here because κ is not sufficiently close to 1. In the following section we discuss and interpret them.

4 Discussion of the results

First of all, we emphasize that the maximum Lyapunov exponent test offers a clearer result than Kolmogorov entropy. In fact, if the maximum Lyapunov exponent is positive, butterfly effect would be implied; on the contrary, it would not. On the other side, $K > 0$ is only a sufficient condition for butterfly effect.

Even if the results obtained with the maximum Lyapunov exponent are in accordance with those of Kolmogorov entropy, it is anyway important

to compare the reliability of the results obtained on sensitive dependence on initial conditions. Let's take, for example, Table 8. When $m = 2$ and $\tau = 16$ or $\tau = 8$, natural gas time series exhibit positive maximal Lyapunov exponents with determinism coefficient, $\kappa = 0.493609$ and $\kappa = 0.452906$, respectively. As we already said, some stochastic systems might show sensitive dependence on initial conditions (Tanaka et al. (1996), Ikeguchi and Aihara (1997), Tanaka et al. (1998)); thus we propose to assume the results on the determinism coefficient κ as the reliability level (in percentage) of the Kolmogorov entropy and the maximal Lyapunov exponents results. In fact, when $m = 2$ and $\tau = 16$ natural gas time series exhibit positive maximal Lyapunov exponents with reliability level at $\simeq 49\%$: too low to be able to conclude that there is strong evidence of sensitive dependence on initial conditions.

Matilla-García Matilla-García (2007) is one who get close to the approach followed in this paper. They both build upon a test on determinism of the analyzed time series.

Matilla-García employs the Kaplan's test Kaplan (1994), which introduces a coefficient K. The nonzero value of K is interpreted as the level of nondeterminism in the data. However, a range $K \in (0, \infty)$ is not very specific. For instance, it does not assess the level of determinism in the analyzed time series but only its order when it is compared with others.

With regards to the futures time series analyzed in our paper, we make the following comparison with respect to other papers.

4.1 Energy commodities

Let us consider Tables 6, 7, 8, 9. For $m = 2$, the heating oil futures shows positive MLE with the maximum reliability level at $\simeq 50\%$ (Table 6); for $m = 3$ the maximum reliability level, for the existing of deterministic butterfly effect, is $\simeq 53\%$ (Table 7). Also in this case the level of κ is too low to be able to conclude that there is strong evidence of deterministic butterfly effect. The same, can be concluded also as for natural gas futures: for $m = 2$, the natural gas futures shows positive MLE with the maximum reliability level at $\simeq 49\%$ (Table 8); for $m = 3$ the maximum reliability level, for the existing of deterministic butterfly effect, is $\simeq 56\%$ (Table 9).

The presence of butterfly effect in energy futures markets is a controversial matter, as can be deduced from the literature review in our introduction: some papers claim to have detected the presence of chaos (butterfly effect), while others state the complete opposite. As regards our evaluations, they confirm the findings of some authors cited in this paper, as Barkoulas et al. (2012) or Kyrtsou et al. (2009): the energy commodities generally contain both a stochastic and a deterministic contribute, which are comparable. Thus, we can say with reasonable certainty that in energy futures markets we cannot talk about deterministic butterfly effect. The same can be stated

for the other commodity futures markets considered here (see Tables 10-25).

Let's now present some comparison results with other papers.

Kyrtsou et al. (2009) have evaluated natural gas and heating oil, over the period from 1994 to mid-January 2008, showing that Lyapunov exponent estimates are negative. They also show the existence of a structure that is partially deterministic. Also in our paper, the futures time series show a not negligible contribute of stochasticity ($\kappa \lesssim 50\%$ for all the measures) which confirms the result about the partial determinism of the structure enlightened by Kyrtsou et al. (2009). Nevertheless, in the case of natural gas and heating oil, the maximum Lyapunov exponents that we have detected are positive, while those estimated by Kyrtsou et al. (2009) are negative: these two approaches give different results on Lyapunov exponent. However, we point out that: 1) the approach followed by Kyrtsou et al. (2009) is different from that employed here and, in fact, they test for chaos by applying methods based on neural networks; 2) the time series do not match because they use daily spot prices, provided by `www.barchart.com`; 3) the sample periods are different, because Kyrtsou et al. (2009) consider the period by 3.1.1994 to 25.1.2008 while we have examined the ranges 06.03.1979 - 15.05.2014 for heating oil and 03.04.1990 - 15.05.2014 for natural gas. A comparison of these two approaches and a new set of measures conducted on the same temporal range could be a useful exercise for the next work.

As for heating oil, Adrangi et al. (2001), for observations on the range 1/02/85 - 03/31/95, employ correlation dimension test, the BDS test and Kolmogrov entropy, without finding evidence of butterfly effect.

Matilla-García (2007) uses observations of natural gas futures princes, starting from 04/03/1990 to 10/19/2005. He discovers the positivity of the largest Lyapunov exponent while for the same series Chwee (1998), examining observations from April 1990 to September 1996, shows no evidence of butterfly effect from the estimation of the Lyapunov spectra. The results on the positivity of MLE obtained by Matilla-García (2007) are in accordance with ours. This is not particularly surprising, since Matilla-García employs a method, by Rosenstein et al. (1993), that belongs to the same family as the one by Wolf et al. (1985) that we use here.

Serletis and Gogas (1999), as for natural gas, examining monthly data from 1985:2 to 1996:12, "test for positivity of the dominant Lyapunov exponent. Before conducting such a nonlinear analysis, the data were rendered stationary and appropriately ltered, in order to remove any linear as well as nonlinear stochastic dependence". They find evidence of butterfly effect in all natural gas liquids markets. Compared to their paper, we do not apply any filtering to data.

5 Conclusions

In this paper we focused on two energy futures series: natural gas and heating oil. We also studied some different commodity series considered in the previous paper Benedetto et al. (2016): two metals series (gold, silver), two grains (corn, oats), two soft commodities (cocoa, coffee) and two other agricultural commodities (feeder cattle, lean hogs) futures from the Chicago Board of Trade (CBOT), Chicago Mercantile Ex-change (CME), Inter Continental Exchange (ICE), New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX), and its division Commodity Exchange (COMEX).

We have employed a package developed in Kodba et al. (2004) and based on the determinism test introduced in Kaplan and Glass (1992). For each commodity we have analyzed the determinism rate κ on varying of τ. Afterward, to check sensitive dependence on initial conditions we have selected the Kolmogorov entropy and the largest Lyapunov exponents tests, using a Matlab code based on algorithms presented, respectively, in Pincus (1991) and Wolf et al. (1985). The main empirical results obtained in the above steps are summarised in Tables 1-25.

The introduction of the reliability level κ was motivated by the fact that time series generated from stochastic systems also might show sensitive dependence on initial conditions: then the employment of only MLE method is not sufficient. The reliability level obtained for the futures considered here is always approximately 50% and this means that the stochastic component and the deterministic one turn up to be approximately in the same proportions. The presence of butterfly effect in energy futures markets is a controversial matter, and the evaluations obtained here confirm the findings of some authors cited in this paper, as Barkoulas et al. (2012) or Kyrtsou et al. (2009). The energy commodities generally contain both stochastic and deterministic contribute, which are comparable. The same can be stated for the other commodity futures markets considered here (see Tables 10-25).

We investigated the presence of both stochastic and deterministic components in time series and, differently from the other authors cited here, we estimated the determinism rate existing in the analyzed data.

All papers that claim they found "chaos" — as Serletis and Gogas (1999), Panas and Ninni (2000), Panas (2001) and Matilla-García (2007) — actually deal with the "butterfly effect", which is only one property of the definition of chaos, according to Devaney et al. (1989). It is not a negligible particular. As they rightly say, "the theory is practice", to mean that the effectiveness of a theory is based on its ability to generate a knowledge of phenomena so accurate as to allow the formulation of reliable forecasts. This also means that an insufficient regard to theoretical aspects might yield results that are not reliable. The contrasting results on the presence of butterfly effect in energy futures markets can be generated, for example, by this misunderstanding. On the other hand, we are facing a great challenge: a time

series could be chaotic, or sensitive to initial conditions (but not chaotic), or stochastic (with positive MLE) or possibly many other things!

6 Appendix 1: Mathematical methodologies of the tests

The sensitive dependence on initial conditions can be checked by Kolmogrov entropy test and the Largest Lyapunov exponents. The definition of Kolmogorov entropy (or Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy Kolmogorov (1958), Sinaĭ (1959), or metric entropy) K can be found, for example, in Farmer (1982) (eq. 7, p. 370). In particular: (i) $K \geq 0$; (ii) K is infinite for random systems; and (iii) $K \neq 0$ for systems which show butterfly effect.

In Pincus (1991), the ApEn method is introduced to numerically quantify the (Kolmogorov) entropy content of a finite time series, as a measure of the regularity of the series itself. The regularity of the series clearly reflects in the predictability of the series. The ApEn computations are conceptually simple and are based on the likelihood the presence of repetitive patterns of fluctuation in a time series renders it more predictable than a time series in which such patterns are absent. ApEn needs two input parameters to be specified in order to evaluate the approximate entropy of a given time series: a block or run length m, and a tolerance window r. More in details, the ApEn algorithm can be formalized as described in Benedetto et al. (2016) and references therein.

Lyapunov exponents determine the rate of divergence or convergence of initially nearby trajectories in the phase space Kodba et al. (2004), Ott (2002), Schuster and Just (2006), Strogatz (2014). The most important observation is that the largest Lyapunov exponent, denoted as λ_{max}, uniquely determines whether the system shows butterfly effect or not. If $\lambda_{max} > 0$ two initially nearby trajectories of the attractor diverge exponentially fast as time progresses, showing a butterfly effect. Lyapunov exponents represent the rate at which the system creates or distorts information. In fact, let us consider two time series, which have different largest Lyapunov exponents, respectively $\lambda^1_{max} > 0$ and $\lambda^2_{max} > 0$. If $\lambda^1_{max}/\lambda^2_{max} > 1$, then the greater this rate, the faster the propagation of the error in the first time series (compared to the second one).

The existing determinism structure in the analyzed time series can be checked also by the correlation dimension test. The correlation dimension test measures a quantity called *correlation dimension* and has usually been introduced as a test for distinguishing randomness and chaoticity Gabisch and Lorenz (2013).

Grassberger and Procaccia (1983a) Grassberger and Procaccia (1983c) show that correlation dimension D_2 can be evaluated using the correlation integral $C(\epsilon)$, which is defined as the probability that a pair of points chosen

randomly, with respect to the natural measure, is separated by a distance less than ϵ from the attractor. For a stochastic signal, $C(\epsilon)$ scales like ϵ^m for all m. In contrast, $C(\epsilon)$ scales like ϵ^{D_2} for m larger than the attractor dimension, if the signal is generated by a deterministic system (Grassberger and Procaccia (1983c), p. 206).

In other words, the following cases are possible: (i) if the value of $C(\epsilon)$ stabilizes at some value as m increases, then the signal is generated by a deterministic system; (ii) if $C(\epsilon)$ continues to vary as m is raised, then the system is to be regarded as stochastic. When case (i) occurs, usually one tests for butterfly effect of the analyzed time series. Nevertheless, in this way we don't get a measure of stochasticity (or determinism) rate of the time series. How reliable are the results obtained on butterfly effect?

In our paper Kaplan and Glass' algorithm Kaplan and Glass (1992) has been preferred to Grassberger and Procaccia algorithm because of its more explicit result. As we have recalled, the determinism coefficient κ is equal to 1 for a deterministic system, while $\kappa = 0$ for a random walk. In a way, κ measures the distance of time series from a deterministic system as well as from a stochastic process. In other words, it measures both the rate of "stochasticity" and that of "determinism" in a time series, while the Grassberger and Procaccia algorithm does not provide such explicit results. Hence, our idea is to take the κ as a measure of the reliability level (in percentage) of the results obtained with the test on butterfly effect.

For a deeper discussion of the mathematical aspects of the methodologies briefly described here see Mastroeni and Vellucci (2016b).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Prof. Matjaž Perc for the C++ code of the package developed in Kodba et al. (2004).

References

(2015), *MATLAB version 8.5.0.197613 (R2015a)*. The Mathworks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts.

Adrangi, Bahram and Arjun Chatrath (2002), "The dynamics of palladium and platinum prices." *Computational Economics*, 19, 179–195.

Adrangi, Bahram, Arjun Chatrath, Kanwalroop Kathy Dhanda, and Kambiz Raffiee (2001), "Chaos in oil prices? Evidence from futures markets." *Energy Economics*, 23, 405–425.

Barkoulas, John T, Atreya Chakraborty, and Arav Ouandlous (2012), "A

metric and topological analysis of determinism in the crude oil spot market." *Energy Economics*, 34, 584–591.

Barnett, William A and Apostolos Serletis (2000), "Martingales, nonlinearity, and chaos." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 24, 703–724.

Benci, Vieri and Giulia Menconi (2005), "Some remarks on the definition of Boltzmann, Shannon and Kolmogorov entropy." *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 73, 187–209.

Benedetto, F, G Giunta, and L Mastroeni (2015), "A maximum entropy method to assess the predictability of financial and commodity prices." *Digital Signal Processing*, 46, 19–31.

Benedetto, F, G Giunta, and L Mastroeni (2016), "On the predictability of energy commodity markets by an entropy-based computational method." *Energy Economics*, 54, 302–312.

Chatrath, Arjun, Bahram Adrangi, and Kanwalroop Kathy Dhanda (2002), "Are commodity prices chaotic?" *Agricultural Economics*, 27, 123–137.

Chwee, Victor (1998), "Chaos in natural gas futures?" *The Energy Journal*, 19, 149–164.

Clyde, William C and Carol L Osler (1997), "Charting: Chaos theory in disguise?" *Journal of Futures Markets*, 17, 489–514.

Devaney, Robert L et al. (1989), *An introduction to chaotic dynamical systems*, volume 13046. Addison-Wesley Reading.

Farmer, J Doyne (1982), "Chaotic attractors of an infinite-dimensional dynamical system." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 4, 366–393.

Franses, Philip Hans and Dick Van Dijk (2000), *Non-linear time series models in empirical finance*. Cambridge University Press.

Gabisch, Günter and Hans-Walter Lorenz (2013), *Business cycle theory: a survey of methods and concepts*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Gençay, Ramazan and Nikola Gradojevic (2010), "Crash of'87 — Was it expected?: Aggregate market fears and long-range dependence." *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 17, 270–282.

Gradojevic, Nikola and Ramazan Gencay (2008), "Overnight interest rates and aggregate market expectations." *Economics Letters*, 100, 27–30.

Grassberger, Peter and Itamar Procaccia (1983a), "Characterization of strange attractors." *Physical Review Letters*, 50, 346.

Grassberger, Peter and Itamar Procaccia (1983b), "Estimation of the Kolmogorov entropy from a chaotic signal." *Physical review A*, 28, 2591.

Grassberger, Peter and Itamar Procaccia (1983c), "Measuring the strangeness of strange attractors." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 9, 189 – 208.

Harrison, Mary Ann and Ying-Cheng Lai (1999), "Route to high-dimensional chaos." *Physical Review E*, 59, R3799.

Ikeguchi, Tohru and Kazuyuki Aihara (1997), "Lyapunov spectral analysis on random data." *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 7, 1267–1282.

Kaplan, Daniel T. (1994), "Exceptional events as evidence for determinism." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 73, 38 – 48.

Kaplan, Daniel T and Leon Glass (1992), "Direct test for determinism in a time series." *Physical Review Letters*, 68, 427.

Kodba, Stane, Matjaž Perc, and Marko Marhl (2004), "Detecting chaos from a time series." *European Journal of Physics*, 26, 205.

Kolmogorov, Andrei Nikolaevich (1958), "A new metric invariant of transient dynamical systems and automorphisms in Lebesgue spaces." In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR (NS)*, volume 119, 861–864.

Kyrtsou, Catherine, Anastasios G Malliaris, and Apostolos Serletis (2009), "Energy sector pricing: On the role of neglected nonlinearity." *Energy Economics*, 31, 492–502.

Mastroeni, Loretta and Pierluigi Vellucci (2016a), ""Butterfly effect" vs chaos in energy futures markets, working paper n. 209, Department of Economics, University of Roma Tre, issn 2279-6916."

Mastroeni, Loretta and Pierluigi Vellucci (2016b), "How reliable are the results on "butterfly effect" and "chaos" in financial and commodity futures markets? work in progress."

Matilla-García, Mariano (2007), "Nonlinear dynamics in energy futures." *The Energy Journal*, 28, 7–29.

Moshiri, Saeed and Faezeh Foroutan (2006), "Forecasting nonlinear crude oil futures prices." *The Energy Journal*, 27, 81–95.

Osler, Carol L and PH Chang (1995), "Head and shoulders: Not just a flaky pattern." *FRB of New York staff report*.

Ott, Edward (2002), *Chaos in dynamical systems*. Cambridge university press.

Packard, Norman H, James P Crutchfield, J Doyne Farmer, and Robert S Shaw (1980), "Geometry from a time series." *Physical Review Letters*, 45, 712.

Panas, E (2001), "Long memory and chaotic models of prices on the London Metal Exchange." *Resources Policy*, 27, 235–246.

Panas, Epaminondas and Vassilia Ninni (2000), "Are oil markets chaotic? A non-linear dynamic analysis." *Energy Economics*, 22, 549–568.

Pincus, Steve and Rudolf E Kalman (2004), "Irregularity, volatility, risk, and financial market time series." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101, 13709–13714.

Pincus, Steven M (1991), "Approximate entropy as a measure of system complexity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 88, 2297–2301.

Rosenstein, Michael T, James J Collins, and Carlo J De Luca (1993), "A practical method for calculating largest Lyapunov exponents from small data sets." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 65, 117–134.

Sarantis, Nicholas (2001), "Nonlinearities, cyclical behaviour and predictability in stock markets: international evidence." *International Journal of Forecasting*, 17, 459–482.

Schuster, Heinz Georg and Wolfram Just (2006), *Deterministic chaos: an introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Serletis, Apostolos and Periklis Gogas (1999), "The north american natural gas liquids markets are chaotic." *The Energy Journal*, 20, 83–103.

Shannon, CE (1948), "A mathematical theory of communication." *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 27, 379–423, 623–656.

Sinaĭ, Ja (1959), "On the concept of entropy for a dynamic system." In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 124, 768–771.

Strogatz, Steven H (2014), *Nonlinear dynamics and chaos: with applications to physics, biology, chemistry, and engineering*. Westview press.

Takens, Floris (1981), "Detecting strange attractors in turbulence." In *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence, Warwick 1980*, 366–381, Springer.

Tanaka, Toshiyuki, Kazuyuki Aihara, and Masao Taki (1996), "Lyapunov exponents of random time series." *Physical Review E*, 54, 2122.

Tanaka, Toshiyuki, Kazuyuki Aihara, and Masao Taki (1998), "Analysis of positive Lyapunov exponents from random time series." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 111, 42–50.

Wolf, Alan, Jack B Swift, Harry L Swinney, and John A Vastano (1985), "Determining Lyapunov exponents from a time series." *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 16, 285–317.

Zhang, Michael Yuanjie, Jeffrey R Russell, and Ruey S Tsay (2001), "A nonlinear autoregressive conditional duration model with applications to financial transaction data." *Journal of Econometrics*, 104, 179–207.